

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed February 21, 2006, the Examiner rejected claim 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 71-73 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Moses et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,425,642); and rejected claims 74 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moses et al.* in view of *Crespo et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,177,768) in further view of *Noma et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,313).

By this Amendment, Applicant proposes to cancel claims 71-75.

II. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner finally rejected claim 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph in the Office Action mailed February 21, 2006. By this Amendment, and to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant proposes to cancel claim 71. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 71 is rendered moot.

III. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner finally rejected claim 71, 72, and 73 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of *Moses et al.* By this Amendment, and to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant proposes to cancel claims 72 and 73. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 72 and 73 is rendered moot.

IV. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 74 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Moses et al.* in view of *Crespo* and *Noma et al.* By this Amendment, and to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant proposes to cancel claims 74 and 75. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 74 and 75 is rendered moot.

V. Conclusion


Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the proposed amendment to cancel claims 71-75 does not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner. Also, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 19, 2006

By: 
Joseph E. Palys
Reg. No. 46,508